

LAZONBY NEIGHBOURHOOD PLAN

2014-2029

CONSULTATION STATEMENT



28/10/17
Submission draft

Contents

1	Background.....	3
2	Initial Meetings	5
3	Questionnaire and public meeting 2015	6
4	Summary draft Inp and the public drop-in event 2016.....	14
5	Statutory Consultees 2016	21
6	Local Businesses 2016.....	22
7	Meetings and further consultation.....	23
8	The executive summary and the public consultation event 2017	27
9	Statutory Consultees 2017	33
10	Pre-submission public consultation 2017	34
11	Appendices	39

1 BACKGROUND

1.1 INTRODUCTION

1.1.1 This document describes the process, which has led to the formulation of the Lazonby Neighbourhood Plan (LNP), and the various consultations, which have taken place to inform its content.

1.1.2 On 8 May 2013 Lazonby Parish Council (LPC) held a special meeting to discuss the Planning Application for 48 homes to be built at Scaur Lane, Lazonby by Story Homes, as concerns had been raised about the impact of the proposed development on the existing village.

1.1.3 At this time the Parish Council had been considering the idea of beginning a Neighbourhood Plan and information and documents were being collected. On 9 October 2013 LPC held a meeting with the residents of the parish to gather their views on the type and location of any development that may take place in the village.

1.1.4 At this point it was felt that a Neighbourhood Plan was definitely needed to ensure that the parish was able to have a say over where development was to be sited, as the Eden Core Strategy did not have sufficient housing sites identified to satisfy the 5-year housing supply required by government and therefore it was obvious that the village would be required to take its share of future housing development. Several Parish Councillors started attending Neighbourhood Plan training sessions from October 2013.

1.1.5 It became clear to the LPC, that if parishioners were to have an input into land use in the parish of Lazonby, then a Neighbourhood Plan was vital.

1.2 LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

1.2.1 This Consultation Report has been prepared to satisfy the legal obligations of the Neighbourhood Planning Regulations 2012. Section 15(2) Part 5 of the Regulations states that a Consultation Statement should:-

- contain details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed Neighbourhood Plan
- explain how they were consulted
- summarise the main issues and concerns raised by the persons consulted

- describe how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the proposed Neighbourhood Plan.

1.2.2 The 400 households and local businesses in the area covered by the Lazonby Neighbourhood Plan (LNP), have been consulted and informed on five occasions. During this period we have engaged face-to-face with 258 people in meetings and discussions. We have also had a written response from 116 Consultees.

1.3 AIMS

1.3.1 The aims of the LNP consultation process were:-

- To involve as much of the community as possible throughout all consultation stages and development, so that the Plan was informed by the views of local people and other stakeholders from the start of the Neighbourhood Planning process
- To ensure that consultation events took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken
- To engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of approaches and communication and consultation techniques

1.4 CONSULTEES

1.4.1 The following groups and bodies were consulted:-

- Every household in the Parish
- Pupils at the local primary school
- Local landowners and businesses in the Parish
- Natural England
- Historic England
- Environment Agency
- Highways Agency
- Cumbria County Council
- Penrith Town Council
- Neighbouring Parish Councils at High Hesket, Aistable, Kirkoswald, Glassonby, Great Salkeld, Langwathby
- W I

2 INITIAL MEETINGS

- 2.1.1 An initial public meeting was widely advertised around the parish and took place in Lazonby Village Hall on 4 December 2013. This was well attended and was followed up by a second public meeting on 11 March 2014 where it became clear that parishioners were supportive of the idea of a Neighbourhood Plan.
- 2.1.2 LPC applied to formally develop a Neighbourhood Plan in July 2014 (see Appendix A) and in November 2014 a further public meeting was advertised for those interested in forming a Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group. This was well attended by parishioners and parish councillors and a list of those willing to be on the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group was constructed, along with contact details and relevant skills.
- 2.1.3 Meanwhile, LPC, as the recognised accountable body started the tendering process for consultants to help formulate the Neighbourhood Plan. The consultants were taken from a list provided by the Royal Town Planning Institute. Letters of Interest from three prospective consultants were received and they were offered the opportunity to attend a question and answer session with two members of LPC prior to the submission of tenders. The sealed tenders were opened in the presence of three Parish Councillors and the Clerk to LPC and each tender was compared against the pre-agreed criteria. H & H Land and Property were awarded the contract as they met all the required criteria and were the lowest tendered price.
- 2.1.4 Consultation to elicit views and interest in taking forward a Neighbourhood Plan for Lazonby had been proceeding intermittently through 2014.
- 2.1.5 The first meeting of the Steering Group took place on 29 January 2015 (agenda and minutes available) where H & H Land and Property were commissioned to deliver the Neighbourhood Plan Project Phase 1.
- 2.1.6 The 2014 consultation process had demonstrated a number of areas where it was felt the LNP could make a contribution and so H & H were asked to develop a questionnaire to be circulated to all properties (residential and commercial) in the parish in order to obtain all views. The distribution of the questionnaire was one of the first tasks undertaken by the newly constituted Steering Group.

3 QUESTIONNAIRE – 14TH MARCH 2015 AND PUBLIC MEETING – 19TH MARCH 2015

3.1 SCOPE OF CONSULTATION

- 3.1.1 The questionnaire was colour printed on two sides of an A4 sheet, folded in half. The outside front of the leaflet included a brief description of a neighbourhood plan, details of by when it needed to be completed, an advertisement of a meeting to discuss the results. There was no name asked for on the completed questionnaire, just a box for an identification code to locate the household to allow the Steering Group to follow up on non-returns. On the back of the leaflet were some suggestions for a vision of Lazonby in the future, some further contact details and where to return the completed questionnaires to, plus an H & H company logo. The inside of the leaflet was for the questionnaire spread over both leaves in landscape. It began with request to answer the questions and to include additional information if necessary.
- 3.1.2 Five principal topic areas were covered: Design, Housing, Employment, Conservation and General. These topic areas had been suggested by the public at meetings of the Parish Council and shown to be areas of concern for parishioners. They were, therefore, considered to be subjects, which the LNP should address. (see Appendix B for the actual Questionnaire).
- 3.1.3 The questionnaires were distributed by volunteers, to every individual household in the Parish at the end of February 2015. There were 4 boxes located in public places around the village to allow parishioners to return the completed questionnaires.
- 3.1.4 After the date by which the questionnaires should be returned, the Steering Group analysed which households had not returned their completed questionnaires by reference to the code, and then visited these households personally. This resulted in some people returning their questionnaire, completing it on-line or stating that they would prefer to come to the public meeting to give their views.
- 3.1.5 All households in the area to be covered by the LNP, were consulted with a total of 400 questionnaires being distributed and 81 completed questionnaires returned, This equals approximately 20% of the households in the parish. (see Appendix C1 for a spread sheet showing the results from the questionnaire)

- 3.1.6 Following the collection and analyses of the questionnaire results, a Public meeting was held in Lazonby Village Hall. H & H Planning Consultants gave an introduction to the Neighbourhood Plan process. A Power Point presentation showing the results gathered from the questionnaire followed this. (See Appendix C2 for Power Point presentation)
- 3.1.7 After a break for refreshments served by LPC there was a general question and answer sessions which resulted in further suggestions and ideas. The meeting was very well attended and resulted in further responses, which have been included in the following results. The Public Meeting also demonstrated that there was support for the development of a Neighbourhood Plan.

3.2 THE RESULTS - DESIGN

- 3.2.1 To the question 'Should there be a design statement?' the answer was overwhelmingly, yes, with 52 respondents answering in the affirmative. There were zero 'no's, but a small number of comments along the lines 'too late', or 'is it worth it?' This was the third highest response to any of the questions and demonstrates the depth of feeling on this issue.
- 3.2.2 To the second design question regarding the level of detail and the areas to be covered there were a variety of answers with 37 respondents wanting greater use of local materials, most referring to the use of sandstone. Thirty-eight respondents mention the character of the design saying that it should 'fit in' with the village, 'be traditional', 'use vernacular architecture' and similar terms. Some of the comments relating to design were made in the later, housing section, of the questionnaire. There were five comments on the spacing of houses and three on the size of gardens, all wanted more generous allotments.
- 3.2.3 Conclusion: a Design Guide emphasising the use of local materials, especially sandstone facings, is the third most commented upon issue after traffic and housing in general.

3.3 THE RESULTS - HOUSING

- 3.3.1 To the question 'should there be a limit on housing, and if so what?' there were 70 affirmative replies, the largest single response. There were four 'no's and five blank answers. The housing questions were not well-phrased to elicit clear views, but 23 respondents made clear statements regarding the size of new developments. All wanted 'small scale'.
- 3.3.2 Some respondents answered 'no' to the limits question but then went on to express a maximum number in the subsidiary question. In total 35 respondents gave an indication on the numbers of houses they would consider to be acceptable. The majority (22) fell into the 'up to 10' bracket, most of these are actually in the less than six range, with a couple in the 10-12 range. A further nine respondents considered 'up to 20' acceptable, most choosing a cut-off at 15 houses. Four respondents found more than 20 acceptable, three of these all selecting 28-30 new houses.
- 3.3.3 It should be noted that at the time this consultation was carried out there was still considerable resentment over the manner in which the Story Homes development of 48 new houses was approved on Appeal and there were a number of comments along the lines of 'what is the point of saying anything about numbers when it is just ignored by the planners'.
- 3.3.4 With regard to site allocation there were 12 actual sites identified by respondents in the questionnaire responses:-

Suggested Development Site	Responses
Old Egg-packing plant	20
Piggeries Site	12
On or opposite Auction Mart	9
Scaur Lane (next to The Meadows – new Story Homes development)	7
Lazonby Hall	1
Adjacent to Rigg House	1
Bells/ around the station	1
Scarrows Lane	1
Agricultural building next to the Lilacs	1
East along railway behind playing field	1
Between Harrow Beck and existing houses	1
Between Fiddlers Lane and Kirkoswald road	1

- 3.3.5 Five more general criteria for selection were suggested:-

Suggested 'General Criteria' Sites	Responses
Brownfield	16
Redevelopment/reuse of redundant buildings	13
Along main roads at edges of village	3
Within the existing village envelope	2
Farms	1

- 3.3.6 The conclusions here are fairly clear with the old egg-packing plant site and the Piggeries site favoured over all the others. Redeveloping the Auction Mart is also highly favoured. It is worth noting that more respondents were in favour of not protecting it for employment as were in favour.
- 3.3.7 Perhaps, unsurprisingly, the next field along Scaur Lane (next to the current Story Homes site) was suggested by seven respondents, often along with a 'world-weary' comment. Three respondents thought development should be restricted to the main roads out of the village. Two of these stated that this was because they held the belief that this would reduce traffic in the village. None of the other specific sites had more than a single mention.
- 3.3.8 In terms of housing specification a wide variety of, sometimes quite detailed, comments were elicited. Most respondents made some comment upon the traffic and/or parking issues. These ranged from having double-yellow lines down the main street to various, one-way systems. The issue of a one-way system was discussed with Cumbria County Council Highways Department but was found to be outside the scope of the Plan. Thirty-two respondents thought that high priority should be given to the affordability of new houses with nine emphasising a priority for local people, either through a restrictive covenant, or other unspecified means.
- 3.3.9 Eight respondents mention the need for starter homes, with the clear sense that these are meant to be affordable properties for younger people, especially those starting families. There were four otherwise unspecified mentions of family homes and a similar number asking for more rental properties. Seven respondents thought that green/eco-friendly properties should be a priority. Six respondents were concerned about infrastructure capacity in the village and one further respondent wanted a sustainable urban drainage scheme.
- 3.3.10 The other main priority for housing was for the elderly. Most assumed this meant a greater need for bungalows in future with 21 respondents seeing this as a priority. There were also six who wanted more priority given to the spacing of housing units, see the section on design above.

3.4 THE RESULTS - EMPLOYMENT

3.4.1 The employment questions were rather nebulous, but 31 respondents thought that all the named employment sites should be maintained as they are. There were varying views from those who disagreed with:

- Maintaining Bells = 21
- Princes (Eden Valley Mineral) Water Company = 26
- Auction Mart = 30
- Laces' Garage = 31

3.4.2 There was a fairly even split between those who wanted to keep the businesses and those who were more ambivalent about their contribution towards the local economy.

Several Employment sites were suggested by respondents:-

Suggested Employment Sites	Responses
Auction Mart	13
Old Egg-packing plant	11
Railway Station	3
Behind the Co-op	2
Lilac's shed	1
Village edge	1
Laces'	1
Methodist Chapel	1
Swimming Pool	1

3.4.3 There was also support for the following business types:-

- Bed and Breakfast = 1
- Pony trekking = 1
- Restaurant/café = 1
- Laundry = 1

3.4.4 When compared to the results from the housing questions this suggests that the old Egg Packing Plant site should be developed for housing. The Auction Mart site should be considered for development and if selected then an allocation of about 60% employment to 40% housing might be appropriate.

3.4.5 It is worth including the results from the 'tourism' question at this point since they have some relevance. Ideas to promote tourism included the following:-

Cafe	9
Improving the Village Environment	9
Extra Accommodation	8
Extra Camp site/caravan spaces	7
Advertising	7
Footpaths	4
Toilets	3
Moving the re-cycling area	3
Car parking at the station	2
Safer roads for horses	1
Organised trips	1

- 3.4.6 When employment and tourism are considered together it is clear that allocating a site for a café should be accorded a high priority, together with supporting the expansion of local accommodation. Nobody mentioned cycling in relation to tourism, although four respondents thought cycle routes were a good idea in relation to Conservation. It is also clear that advertising the local area should receive a higher priority from both 'Visit Eden' and the LPC.
- 3.4.7 'Improving the village environment' collects together a number of responses from 'not dropping litter', 'being more friendly to people' and demolishing 'eye-sores'
- 3.4.8 Promoting homeworking produced a number of responses of which improving rural internet, was the most common. Some sort of financial support or rates relief was suggested by five respondents, and improved mobile phone coverage by three. Two respondents wanted a development fund to be set-up and paid for by developers. Two also wanted public internet access – possibly at the Village Hall, or a wi-fi zone. One person wanted to canvass the local MP (Rory Stewart) until he did something about homeworking improvements.
- 3.4.9 Ideas for promoting farm diversity were concentrated in three main areas:- supporting/promoting a farmers' market/local produce shop (nine respondents); two went further with a 'fair-price scheme'. There was also support for allowing new uses for redundant farm buildings (12 respondents) and for allowing renewables (four respondents), including wind turbines. Other suggestions were for specialist advice and open-days.

3.5 THE RESULTS - CONSERVATION AND GENERAL

- 3.5.1 The Conservation and General sections have been combined since they seem to have been treated that way by many of the respondents.
- 3.5.2 The issue that was raised most often was that of footpaths (by 26) with improvement, extension and upkeep all considered to be of high priority. Footpaths must be considered as a key issue for the LNP since the word footpaths was not mentioned anywhere on the questionnaire. Eleven of the respondents wanted a footpath to Kirkoswald. The river, the bridge and riverside walks were considered to be important for 25 respondents with one highlighting the need for erosion control.

- 3.5.3 Many people thought that the principal buildings and facilities in the village should be maintained (Church, Primary School, Village Hall, Swimming Pool, Camp Site, Community Play Park, Will Pool (Duck Pond), Co-op and Railway Station). Three respondents thought that the small shop Croglin Designs was important. Other less obvious features regarded as important were SAC/SSSIs (5 respondents), the Main Street (5), Woodland (4), Lazonby Fell (3), Greenspaces (6), Village pubs (8), Farmland (1), Bateman's Row (1), round building at the Auction Mart (1).
- 3.5.4 Eight respondents thought that the parish should have another Conservation Area (in addition to the railway line), four promoted cycle routes and three were concerned about dog-poo. Signage, both heritage and more general information was raised by eight respondents with seven wanting either a map or booklet on the area, the village or the river. Nine respondents raised the issue of off-road parking and a further two, road-access with four wanting to limit speed through the village. Five respondents wanted more buses and/or trains. Only two suggested an additional play area with a further respondent mentioning children as an issue to be considered in the plan.
- 3.5.5 Three respondents were concerned with overall infrastructure capacity, in addition to the five who mentioned this with regard to housing, four wanted allotments. Two respondents mentioned health and one wanted a health centre. Four respondents saw green energy as being important with energy efficiency raised by two others and tree planting by three. Six respondents wanted some sort of compulsory purchase regime for village eyesores such as the old egg packing plant on the High Street next to the historic village centre.
- 3.5.6 Other issues raised were street-lighting (3), crime (3), a bigger school (1), size of vehicles (2), post box on Barton Dale (1), twinning (1), expanding the graveyard (1), disabled access (1), drainage (2). One respondent suggested applying to the Heritage Lottery fund to enable the purchase of the egg-packing plant for a community development and one wanted the railway station returned to its original use.

- 3.5.7 The results from the consultation exercises were utilised to underpin the principal policies contained within the Neighbourhood Plan and to inform the topics, which should be covered, and the weighting to be given to them. The consultation provided fairly clear guidance on topics such as housing and design where there was a consensus around small developments with the designs reflecting more traditional village housing and emphasising the use of sandstone to maintain the character of the village. The demolition of perceived eye-sores and the reuse of those sites was an important issue for many.
- 3.5.8 The importance of footpaths was clearly demonstrated and has consequently assumed a greater significance in the development of the LNP. There was a less clear-cut response in regard to the employment sites, possibly reflecting the fact that the principal businesses have relatively few employees resident in the parish although all those who work in the parish were consulted through their place of work.
- 3.5.9 Provision of a café is considered to be important for tourism and would also serve to improve social cohesion, which was brought out obliquely through the desire to improve the 'village environment'.
- 3.5.10 Traffic was mentioned in relation to housing, conservation and design, but there was no consensus around which a traffic policy to include in the plan could be readily formulated.
- 3.5.11 One sentiment that was seen on a number of responses was the desire for the village of Lazonby to remain a village and not become a town. To this end it was agreed that a 'red line' should be drawn around the village to delineate the extent of the development.

4 SUMMARY DRAFT LNP AND THE PUBLIC DROP – IN EVENT – 16TH JANUARY 2016

4.1 SCOPE OF CONSULTATION

- 4.1.1 By November 2015 the draft LNP was taking shape and the Steering Group decided that further consultation was needed to ensure that the Plan satisfied those areas and concerns raised by the questionnaire. A Summary of the draft LNP was constructed (see Appendix D for Summary Leaflet) and turned into an A4 double page leaflet which was then distributed by hand to all households in the Parish, by email to the remaining Statutory Consultees and also displayed on the LPC website. The leaflet included the date for the Public Drop-In event and also details of how to comment by email or telephone.
- 4.1.2 The Drop-in event was advertised by posters around the village and on the LPC website. It was held in the Village Hall, the atmosphere was friendly and positive and was attended by 38 parishioners and all members of the Steering Group. (see Appendix E for Photographs of Drop-In event). Annotated maps and plans were displayed around the room with 'post-it' notes available for people to comment. Steering Group members welcomed all attendees individually with an offer of refreshments and a seat at a coffee table where they could discuss their thoughts and ideas about the LNP.

4.2 THE RESULTS

- 4.2.1 These were summarised on a profoma (see Appendix F for copy of Summary sheet) to be analysed later. Analysis showed that parishioners were in agreement with the points detailed in the summary draft of the LNP and no one had any objections to what was being suggested and some points were expanded upon. The summary of results from this consultation event can be seen below:-

Summary of Key Issues/Concerns	How Issues have been addressed
Open & Local Green Space <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More needed at top of village – next to the Meadows (Story Development) x 5 • Indoor recreation area to allow winter/indoor cricket/bowls etc – possibly on Recreation Field site (owned by LPC) x 2 	<p>Area designated in draft plan for playground on site allocated for housing development (Scaur Lane) - Policy D7</p> <p>LPC willing but Covenant on Recreation Field does not allow building of any structure other than a Sports Pavilion for storage and changing purposes.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see the Parish Recreation Field used more for recreation x 2 • Mountain bike/cycle skills area. Could be on parish field along the lines of those in Hammonds Pond etc. • Consider land <u>exchange</u> – old playing field for land on Scaur Lane for play area. • Continue programme of “pocket parks” • Management programme needed for all Parish land • Road names – streets need names and signs • Safe field space for exercising dogs • Need more facilities for young children x 2 • Retain open spaces in village • Amenity support to be included in any future developments of more than 5 houses • Shop at Scaur Lane x 2 	<p>Part of field has been leased to Scouts/Cubs to use for recreational activities by LPC.</p> <p>To be discussed with LPC but could be restricted by Covenant.</p> <p>Land exchange is not possible as Sports field has a Covenant on it that prevents it from being used for anything other than recreation</p> <p>Scaur Close Green is being developed as a ‘pocket park’</p> <p>To be discussed with LPC</p> <p>LPC currently in discussion with EDC about this issue.</p> <p>Supported subject to suitable land being available</p> <p>Additional amenity space has been identified at Scaur Lane</p> <p>Existing amenity spaces will be protected and additional amenity space created at Scaur Lane</p> <p>Amenity space identified on land suggested for housing development at Scaur Lane – Policy D7</p> <p>Plan encourages the establishment of small businesses</p>
<p>Footpaths</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Footpath needed from Lazonby swimming pool to Kirkoswald x 10 • Riverside Paths:- reinstatement of historic path along river towards Armathwaite x 2; extend riverside path to Eden Lacy and cut up from river to lane x 4; • Make more of the footpaths circular especially along the river x 3 • Believed that historically there was a walk though to Great Salkeld • Protect Banktop footpath from development . • More circular routes, particularly in the village and maybe a connection between High Seat Hill and Scarrows or footbridge over railway at the Auction Mart • Reinstate footpath through Hodgsons to Story development 	<p>Included in draft plan – Policy D8</p> <p>Planning permission already granted for development</p> <p>Would be considered if opportunity arises</p> <p>Being actioned by EDC</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The new right of way through garden ground on B6413 to the Story Development should be extinguished. Indeed the entire footpath, which is no longer used, should go. This is the "dog leg" from B6413 to Scaur Lane • Connect school lane to Jackstones Slack over Vicarage tunnel • Sections of existing footpaths should be connected • As many usable footpaths as possible should be encouraged including more use of Lazonby Fell areas • Old footpaths reinstated • Cycle paths/tracks – particularly to Kirkoswald • Join up the footpaths around Bleaberry Hill to give circular routes. Opens it up for bikes – may help employment/tourism (like at Whinlatter) x 2 	<p>Being considered by EDC</p> <p>Would be considered if opportunity arises but is currently private land</p> <p>Would be considered if Opportunity arises but is currently private land</p> <p>Included in draft plan - Policy D6; Policy D8</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy D8</p> <p>Included in draft plan - Policy D9</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy D8</p>
Design	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing should be in keeping with village situation x 4 • Not opposed to something different so long as it is well designed. Not all properties need to be built in stone. Timber and glass can be attractive • Appropriate design for location – stone/slate etc on the main road frontages and sympathetic rendered block work and window/door design. No red tiles anywhere! • The village is already such a mix of designs that anything works – maybe no 60's style concrete though! • Non domestic buildings should fit in without gaudy signs or neon lights • Preference for sandstone x 4 • More low cost housing needed (< £130,000) 	<p>Included in draft plan – Policy D3; Policy D4</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy D3</p> <p>Included in draft plan as read with the Design Guide – Policy D3; Policy D4</p> <p>Included in draft plan as read with the Design Guide – Policy D3</p> <p>Covered by Eden Local Plan</p> <p>Included in draft plan as read with the Design Guide – Policy D3</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy H2</p>
Employment	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Offices spaces to rent out and parking (like at Warwick Mill, Carlisle):- at Auction Mart site x 4; at Piggeries site x 2; Old Egg Packing Plant; • Keep existing provision. Encourage small businesses and workshops – cuts down on commuting 	<p>Included in draft plan – Policy B1</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy B1</p> <p>Included in draft plan - Policy B1</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More employment in the village would reduce commuting and improve local economy but how do we encourage new businesses? • No prospect of substantial employment so village will remain largely a commuter village • Work with Bells and Water Plant to grow businesses • A cafe would be great – more opportunity for home workers to network • Keep the auction mart • Small/cottage industry to be encouraged • Black's Workshops and Yard as a brownfield site could provide village employment • Beech Lea Workshop could provide village employment 	<p>Would be considered if opportunity arises</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy B3</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy B1</p> <p>Would be considered if opportunity arises</p> <p>Would be considered if opportunity arises</p> <p>Would be considered if opportunity arises</p>
Conservation	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important to retain historic buildings eg. Octagonal cattle/sheep selling ring • With good planning, official conservation area status should not be needed • Maintenance of river banks to prevent erosion and footpath erosion 	<p>Covered by Eden Local Plan</p> <p>Covered by Eden Local Plan</p> <p>Outwith plan remit</p>
Tourism, visitors and local amenity	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Coffee Shop/Café/Farm Shop needed:- at egg packing plant (meeting point with garden seats and flowers) x 3; in Village Hall or maybe using flat next door x 2; in Co-op in post office side; extended at Lazonby Pool - more welcoming approach at the swimming pool in recent years has been good for the village but obviously seasonal and time limited • Eden Valley promoted as quieter alternative to Lake District through website and Face Book links x 2 • Signage – work with S & C railway for visitor attractions • Lazonby Fell as open country areas are under used resource/visitor attraction • Encourage Bed & Breakfast • Encourage Tourists by promoting cycle routes throughout parish with café stop in Lazonby • Methodist Chapel – possible space for Ecumenical use/play centre/young people's work space/focus for tourism (local leaflets – things to do/B & B etc)/café 	<p>Included in draft plan – Policy B3; Policy B4</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy D6</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy B1; Policy B4</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy D9</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy B3</p> <p>Not within the scope of LNP</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More trains stopping at Lazonby 	
Roads and Parking	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Definite need for parking to remove congestion on the main road which has caused minor accidents:- opposite village Hall x 2; on old egg packing site x 2; in centre of village/Croglin Designs x 2; at bottom of village near/behind Co-op x 2; • Parking enforced down hill - everyone parking on left going down hill – currently a tradition but not enforceable • Problem with parking – yellow lines, 20mph speed limit, parking/sleeping policemen/narrowing of road/monitoring existing yellow lines x 2 • 250 extra houses in order to get a bypass is too much to ask and would turn Lazonby into a town. Traffic calming and “pull ins” may help and signs about illegality of mounting the pavement! • No obvious solution! Expansion brings more traffic and congestion x 2 • Can't restrict on-street parking for those on main road as they have no space for parking • Not sure who would use a bypass – it's not really a major thoroughfare • Traffic lights (full or part time) at village hall 	<p>Included in draft plan – Policy I2</p> <p>Highways responsibility and already discussed with LPC</p> <p>Discussed by LPC and discounted by Cumbria County Council</p>
Housing	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Houses next to egg packing station don't fit in whereas ones down next to the Midland are in-keeping with the area • Egg packing station – what can be done? Apartments with parking beneath • Prevent building at back of existing properties • No more big estates – more bungalows for ageing population x 2 • Need for more affordable housing x 2; housing for locals x 2; • Local rented housing private/local authority/housing association. • Small scale development only on Scour Lane (max 10) • Development on A6 at Heskett Park– good idea 	<p>See Design Guide</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy H1 + Housing Site allocations</p> <p>Covered in Eden Local Plan</p> <p>Included in draft plan - Policy H1</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy H2</p> <p>LNP has a neutral position regarding tenure. Market forces will decide this</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy H1</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy H1 + Housing Allocations</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developments for <u>older</u> people on Laces' (piggery) site linked to Eden Court to share facilities • No more 4 & 5 bedroomed houses • New housing is good as long as infrastructure keeps up – eg. New roads rather than extra loading on existing side roads and increase in school/bus places • Like the housing allocation, especially Auction Mart and High Hesket • Proposed use of Auction Mart site for residential purposes (Fiddlers Lane) has merit – subject to new vehicular access to B6413 • At Barton Dale • Maintain plot potentially reserved for housing development at top of village (next to Meadows site) for amenities for children in the area – now a large number • New build should be in-keeping with surroundings – prefer small sites • Encourage varied housing (ie brick, style, size) don't put constraints on that limits design and different building technology 	<p>Included in draft plan – Policy H3</p> <p>Included in draft plan - Policy I2</p> <p>Included in draft plan - Housing Allocations</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Discounted Sites</p> <p>No room for further development</p> <p>Included in draft plan - Policy D7</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy D3; Policy D4</p> <p>Included in Design Guide</p>
Other	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cycle way • Regular Bus Service/Public Transport x 4 (Fellrunner is in Penrith for too long 11am – 3pm existing, could it come back sooner? Or another bus service 11am – 1pm as 2 hours in Penrith is enough) • Electric Sub Station – too low lying prone to flooding • Green Energy - could use be made of the river x 2 • NO wind farms x 2 • Make sure good flood plains are maintained • Expand medical facilities • Auction Mart • Street lighting by church • Car parking at station for rail users • Handrails (lack of) from B6413 to station 	<p>Included in draft plan – Policy D9</p> <p>Not within scope of this plan</p> <p>Not within scope of this plan</p> <p>River protected by SAC – beyond the terms of reference of this plan</p> <p>Covered by Eden Local Plan</p> <p>Covered by Eden Local Plan</p> <p>Not within scope of this plan</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Discounted Sites</p> <p>Not within scope of this plan</p> <p>Discussed by LPC but suitable land unavailable</p> <p>In progress through LPC</p> <p>In progress through LPC</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Better road signage throughout the village x 2• Café/Craft centre to be encouraged if the opportunity comes up.	Included in draft plan – Policy B3
--	---

5 STATUTORY CONSULTEES – 18TH JANUARY 2016

Natural England	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should be following Eden Core Strategy as are ahead of Eden Local Plan and as such should not rely on policies in the Eden Local Plan 	Eden Local Plan will have replaced Eden Core Strategy by the time this Plan is in place.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The NP seems to be allocating development over and above the number required in the Eden Core Strategy. If this is the case then biodiversity must be protected and enhanced in accordance with paragraphs 109 to 125 of the National Planning Policy Framework 	See above
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The best way to do this is to include a biodiversity policy in the NP 	Included in draft plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opportunities to incorporate features into new build or retro fitted buildings which are beneficial to wildlife, such as incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nesting boxes should be considered as part of any new development proposals 	Covered in Eden Local Plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ensure that the area's best and most versatile agricultural land is conserved through making the links to policy within the appropriate overarching plan 	Included in draft plan
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The map identifies potential housing sites in close proximity to the River Eden site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) and Special Area of Conservation (SEA). If environmental effects are predicted a SEA (Strategic Environmental Assessment) screening exercise should be undertaken 	Included in draft plan
Historic England	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment to make 	
Environment Agency	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No comment to make at this stage 	
Highways Agency	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No concerns as the parish of Lazonby lies some way from the M6 	
No response from:- Cumbria County Council; High Hesket Parish Council; Ainstable Parish Council; Kirkoswald Parish Council; Glassonby Parish Council; Great Salkeld Parish Council; Langwathby Parish Council; Penrith Town Council;	

6 LOCAL BUSINESSES – 18TH JANUARY 2016

Hesket Park	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the idea of creating affordable housing/retirement bungalows on the 37 serviced pitches that are currently available. • Penrith – Carlisle bus service passes the door every 2 hours • Local shops, pub, school and doctors nearby 	Included in draft plan
Bells of Lazonby	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment 	
Princes (Eden Valley Mineral) Water Company	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment 	

7 MEETINGS AND FURTHER CONSULTATION

- 7.1 Monthly meetings of the Steering Group continued throughout the writing of the Plan with Minutes being displayed on the LPC website (see Appendix G for Time Line of meetings).
- 7.2 In October 2016 the Planning Department at EDC was consulted for their suggestions as to what may need to be amended in the draft plan before it was ready for further consultation. The comments can be seen in the following table along with actions taken by the Steering Group:-

Comments from Kayleigh Lancaster (EDC)

Policy Ref/Page No.	Section/Sentence	Comments	Action
Pg.7 Map	Map	Are you intending to identify this as the settlement boundary for development? If so, this should be made clear as Eden does not currently have any settlement boundaries.	Reworded, yes settlement boundary
Policy D2	<i>“Development on brownfield sites will be encouraged. Applicants coming forward with proposals involving development on greenfield sites will need to demonstrate that wholly exceptional circumstances exist and that there is an absence of any alternative suitable sites.”</i>	How does this fit with the site allocations? Most of the sites are greenfield – would you be expecting all brownfield sites to be developed before greenfield sites could be brought forward? Or does this apply to sites which are not allocated (Policy H1)?	Clarified
	<i>“Respondents to consultation for this plan have expressed a strong wish for ‘eye-sores,’ vacant and derelict sites in the village, to be developed and brought back into use in advance of any new sites being released for development”</i>	This isn't 'typical policy wording and would perhaps be better as explanatory text for the policy. Alternatively it could be re-worded to read as more of a policy requirement.	Separated as comment
Policy D3	<i>“New Developments”</i>	Is this intended to mean <u>all</u> new development i.e. house extensions, agricultural buildings etc.	Clarified

Policy Ref/Page No.	Section/Sentence	Comments	Action
Policy D5	<i>“or applications affecting an area of greater than 200 square metres in extent”</i>	Does this mean all site exceeding 200 square metres or where there is 200 square metres of trees/hedges?	Clarified
Policy D8	<i>Mentions “four specific proposals”</i>	Only three are listed.	Changed to two
	<i>“An agreement with Lazonby Primary School to keep the School Field open to the community after school hours”</i>	This is not something planning can require - whilst it might be an aspiration of the PC we wouldn't be able to require this as a condition of a planning permission. It is also up to the school/landowner whether access is granted – from our work on Open Space we discovered a lot of schools restricting access due to safety reasons and therefore insurance/liability concerns.	Deleted
Policy D9	<i>“Existing footpaths”</i>	Does this relate to Public Rights of Way, adopted footpaths or all footpaths? Some clarity would be useful for users of the plan.	Clarified in Plan
	<i>In particular, extending existing or adding new paths where ‘circular’ walking routes may be created.</i>	This policy could only work if a development required such infrastructure to make it acceptable in planning terms. As such, it might be difficult to achieve these aspirations through the planning system.	Made clear that this could only arise from new development but a clear aim resulting from consultation so may have to become a LPC project.
Policy D10	<i>“A new Lazonby Cycleway is proposed”</i>	See above comments on D9....	Made clear that this could only arise from new development, but a clear aim resulting from consultation so may have to become a LPC project.
Policy H2	<i>Affordable Housing in Perpetuity</i>	This policy may need to be amended in light of recent changes and the introduction of ‘Starter Homes’ as an affordable housing product. Starter Homes may not require a local connection nor will they be required to remain affordable in perpetuity. We are awaiting the regulations to be published by Government.	Amended to take account of the latest policy just published
Policy H3	<i>“The plan requires all other properties currently managed as elderly accommodation (bungalows in Barton Dale) to continue in such specific use”</i>	Planning can only control the use of properties that are subject to a legal agreement or planning condition attached at the time of granting planning approval. Any property with the benefit of an unrestricted consent will be able to be used for any residential use without restriction.	Reworded
Para 7.3.2	<i>Table 3 – Discounted Sites</i>	Have these sites been discounted as potential sites for sheltered housing but are suitable for other housing? It is possible to devise a policy which requires a % of a development to provide adapted	Reworded to clarify

Policy Ref/Page No.	Section/Sentence	Comments	Action
		or accessible accommodation - http://planningguidance.communities.gov.uk/blog/guidance/housing-optional-technical-standards/accessibility-and-wheelchair-housing-standards/	
Policy B2	<i>“new buildings will only be permitted in exceptional cases where existing structures for repair or conversion are not present”</i>	This seems to be slightly in conflict with the title of the policy - perhaps the policy should be titled 'Farm Diversification', then each point can explain the circumstances under which such proposals may be considered acceptable, rather than referring specifically to the construction of new buildings in the policy title when they would only be considered in exceptional circumstances.	Clarified and reworded
Policy B6	<i>Conversion of Rural Buildings.</i>	Potential Conflict with Policy RUR2 of the emerging Local Plan - http://www.eden.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?allid=54942	Additional wording added
Para 9.1.1	<i>Wind Energy Suitable Areas</i>	Does the Parish Council intend to explore this? The Eden Local Plan has identified the following areas: http://www.eden.gov.uk/EasySiteWeb/GatewayLink.aspx?allid=55306	Wording added
Policy I2	<i>Parking and Traffic</i>	As with the footpaths and cycle ways, planning can only require contributions to infrastructure improvements that are required to make the development being applied for acceptable. It may therefore be difficult to justify how a development proposal will be required to improve parking in other locations elsewhere within the village unless there's a specific and identified link to the development proposal.	As this was an important topic raised during consultation it will become a project for LPC to progress

- 7.3 In November 2016 a Leaflet summarising the draft LNP was prepared and distributed to all households in the Parish giving details of where questions could be asked or comments made. The leaflet also contained the projected timetable to show the likely date of the Referendum. (see Appendix H)
- 7.4 A copy of the draft Plan was also given to a knowledgeable resident who is Chair of the local History Society for her to read through and make any necessary corrections to the veracity of the information given about the Parish. These were then incorporated into the draft Plan.
- 7.5 Three residents raised questions about the Plan, which were answered by members of the Steering Group.

- 7.6 After comments from the Consultants (Intelligent Plans and Examinations (IPE) Ltd) who undertook the Health Check for the Steering Group, the Policies regarding 'Views' and 'Homeworking' were deleted. References to a local Community Infrastructure Levy was also removed as the Group were notified that EDC would not take a local CIL into account as it did not support the idea of CILs only allowing Section 106 agreements.
- 7.6 A letter requesting a Screening Opinion on the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment was sent to Eden District Council in January 2017 (see Appendix I) asking for a decision by the end February 2017.

8 THE EXECUTIVE SUMMARY AND THE PUBLIC CONSULTATION EVENT – 11TH FEBRUARY 2017

8.1 SCOPE OF CONSULTATION

- 8.1.1 In January 2017 an Executive Summary of the draft Plan (see Appendix J) was produced and distributed to all households in the Parish. This also gave details of where the full suite of documents (complete draft Plan, Consultation Statement, Basic Conditions Statement, Design Guide) could be viewed or obtained as a hard copy. This was the first time that the submission suite of documents was sufficiently completed to allow public scrutiny. An email and postal address were also included to allow comments to be made about the now almost completed Plan.
- 8.1.2 A Public Consultation meeting was widely advertised by putting a flyer in every house in the Parish and Notices up around the village. This allowed all members of the Parish to meet with the Steering Group face to face, to facilitate in depth discussion, questions to be asked and large scale plans and maps to be viewed. There were also full copies of all the draft submission documents available along with clear details of how to access the website and a dedicated email address to allow comments to be sent to the Steering Group. The meeting took place on Saturday 11th February in the Village Hall, Lazonby. (see Appendix K) and was well attended by 47 residents of the parish. Many residents had newly arrived in the Village as The Meadows development had been completed since the last Consultation exercise had taken place.

8.2 THE RESULTS

8.2.1 Residents were encouraged to record their comments on a comments slip provided as they entered and also available around the room. There were also post-it notes available next to all the maps and plans to allow residents to record their thoughts directly onto the visual material. Most residents also took the opportunity to speak directly to members of the Steering Group. There were a number of congratulatory comments received expressing the same sentiment as made by one villager “ *Thank you for working so hard on a very thoughtful and inclusive plan. It is a very good document*”.

8.2.2 The results of this Consultation are summarised below and have been categorised in line with the sections in the draft Plan.

Summary of Key Issues/Concerns	How Issues have been addressed
Design and Conservation – Section 6	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amenity space needed at top of village due to increase in number of families in The Meadows and Scaur Lane developments. Fully support the amenity area identified for Scaur Lane • Support the idea of an amenity area on the Scaur Lane site but should be put on the front of the site near Barton Dale as it would benefit more people there. • Amenity area should have frontage onto Scaur Lane along with suitable landscaping. • Need major developers to contribute to expansion of amenities eg. school, play area, doctors. • Footpath from The Lilacs to Greengarth Farm needs the rural aspect preserving, as it is best amenity path from village. • Footpaths are inadequate. We need new footpaths as well as retention of existing ones. Lazonby fell is public access land to which there is no formal public access. Wan Fell is public access land to which existing access has been blocked. • Footpath Policy D8 does not make sense – please rewrite • Support the idea of linking existing rights of way within Parish and also creating off-road paths linking Lazonby with Kirkoswald and Great Salkeld. 	<p>Area designated in draft plan for amenity area on site allocated for housing development at Scaur Lane. - Policy D7</p> <p>Will move the line on the Plan so that the Play Area fronts on to Scaur Lane</p> <p>Play Area covered by Policy D7. School and Doctors responsibility of CCC</p> <p>Covered by Policy D8</p> <p>Covered by Policy D8 Access to Wan Fell is now by a stile further along the road. The plan cannot create new footpaths only support existing paths.</p> <p>To be modified in light of Health Check comments.</p> <p>Supported in draft Plan – Policy D8</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional walk in North of Parish on Blaze Fell would be appreciated. • The public footpath between Lamb Lea and Croglin Toys was closed c 1999. • Parish land around Croglin Toys should be designated an amenity open space. • Consider adding the beech trees to the NW of the Church and the pine trees along the side of Harrow Beck across from old chapel and Croglin Designs. 	<p>Blaze Fell is open access land but access to it is over private farmland from the East but it can be accessed from the north west by 2 routes from the Armathwaite Road – Policy D8</p> <p>Noted – public meeting held at the time.</p> <p>Designated as local Greenspace in draft Plan.</p> <p>Added to draft Plan</p>
<p>Housing Development – Section 7</p>	

<p>Aware of the increasing ageing of the population and would support any move to increase housing appropriate for elderly and disabled people.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local GP practices have specific demographic data showing needs of and numbers of elderly and frail population within the parish. The proposed Scaur Land development should be lowered as The Meadows development was lowered by up to 2 metres. If the site cannot be lowered then bungalows should be built bordering the affected Meadows site. Concerned that Scaur Lane development is too close to the road. It needs to be further back with a green space amenity area on the front. Townfoot Farmhouse and Stables is a listed building but could be marketed as a restoration project to create a very desirable property and a visual asset to the village landscape, if the owner would sell. Very supportive of a village settlement boundary Development on A6 at Hesket Park– good idea Think Plan should include a specific statement that housing should not be built anywhere other than on the preferred sites. In a recent case reported in the media the Neighbourhood Plan was over-ruled by the planning inspector who ruled in favour of the developer because the local NP failed to include an explicit statement that housing must not be built anywhere other than on the preferred sites. Using 33dph to calculate housing seems too high. 	<p>Steering Group will look at demographics as suggested and add as an appendix to a rewritten Policy H3, which will include a reference to housing for the elderly.</p> <p>No specific evidence found in local demographic data but Policy H3 amended to show increase in elderly residents in Parish.</p> <p>Covered by Design Guide</p> <p>Covered by Policy D7</p> <p>Would be supported by LPC if site became available.</p> <p>Included in draft Plan</p> <p>Included in draft plan – Policy H1 + Housing Allocations</p> <p>Covered by Policy D2 as far as is allowed under Planning Policy guidelines.</p> <p>Figure used is that which is recommended by the NPPF – (between 30 – 50 dph).</p>
<p>Microenergy – Section 9</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support the idea of micro-energy generation but examples of nuisance to take into account include the flicker from light through the rotating blades. 	<p>Covered by Policy M1</p>
<p>Infrastructure – Section 10</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to address traffic flow on road between Village Hall and Telephone Exchange before further expansion is allowed. 	<p>Beyond remit of NP. CCC Highways issue.</p> <p>Beyond remit of NP.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public Transport plan needs to recognise that there is no access to Penrith unless by car or bike. There is no bus service to get villagers to Penrith or Carlisle in time for work. Concerned that further possible development behind The Lilacs site (23 – 30 units) would mean a large increase in traffic on to the main street where there are already many pinch points and problems with traffic in this vicinity. Huge concerns that the development of more housing on Scaur Lane will double the volume of traffic using Barton Dale and the main road and also be dangerous for the children on their bikes who already live in that area. Concerned about the amount of traffic that will be generated by more houses being built on Scaur Lane and the access problems out on to the main road outside the Village Hall. Concerned about the parking on the Main Street and how this is going to cause even more problems with an increase in houses in the village. With the likely increase of traffic in the village there is no car parking available other than on the main road outside the Co-op. Could the plan include a village car park? The growth of the village will have an impact on transport. Suggestion that a new south road is constructed to take the traffic away from the village centre. Lack of off-street parking is a major concern. 	<p>Beyond remit of NP.</p> <p>Addressed in draft Plan</p> <p>Beyond remit of NP</p> <p>This issue was discussed with Cumbria County Council Highways Department but was found to be outside the scope of the Plan.</p> <p>Provision of car park to serve Co-op, Village Hall, Church and Midland Hotel is beyond the remit of NP. Policy 12 specifies the need for 2 off-street parking spaces for each new house built.</p>
Other concerns	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The growth of the village will have an impact on school places. The local primary school is full in some year groups. The plan does not mention the capacity of the local primary school, doctor's surgery or bus services ie local facilities. The plan states that "within the parish there is an absence of medical services and support for both the very young and the elderly" which gives a false impression as the 	<p>Would be covered by Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>Would be covered by Section 106 Agreement. Outwith the limits of this Plan.</p> <p>Section to be rewritten.</p>

<p>GP practice is only 1.5 miles away and has its own pharmacy, Eden Court is available for elderly residents and the school has a nursery.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Allotments – demand for but lack of permission granted by landowner. Could a suitable site be identified.• Lack of Gas Supply	<p>Not within the remit of this plan but should be raised with LPC.</p> <p>Not a planning matter but is left to the commercial judgement of the developers.</p>
--	---

9 STATUTORY CONSULTTEES – MAY 2017

A response to the letter requesting a Screening Opinion on the need for a Strategic Environmental Assessment that was sent to Eden District Council in January 2017 (see Appendix I) was received in May 2017. The response from Historic England (see Appendix L ii), the Habitats Regulation Assessment (see Appendix M) and the Strategic Environmental Assessment (see Appendix N) did not raise any concerns that required amendments to the draft Plan.

A meeting was also arranged between the local Planning Authority (EDC) and members of the Steering Group concerning the proposal to allocate Hesket Park for a residential development site. The initial proposal for 35 dwellings, that would be 100% affordable, was originally felt not to be compatible with the Eden Local Plan by EDC. Following discussion it was agreed that the site was suitable for 25 dwellings of which 30% would be affordable.

10 PRE-SUBMISSION PUBLIC CONSULTATION – 17TH JULY TO 27TH AUGUST 2017

A letter was sent to all Statutory Consultees notifying them of the pre-submission Public Consultation and giving details of where the draft pre-submission Plan and the associated Design Guide could be viewed (see Appendix O). Paper copies of the documents were placed in Lazonby at the Village Hall, the Co-op and St Nicholas Church, and in Penrith at the Town Hall, the Mansion House and the Library. Two public consultation events were set up at the Village Hall and notices giving all of these details were placed on noticeboards around the Parish and in the local newspaper, (see Appendix P) and on the Local Planning Website (see Appendix Q).

Below are the comments received as a result of this Consultation process:-

Natural England	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection – see Appendix N No further comment to make – by email dated 09.08.2017 	
Historic England	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection – see Appendix L ii Recommend working on evidence base and policies to preserve and enhance Lazonby's heritage. Ensure that policies are picked out clearly from general text. Disappointed that Section 6 contains no reference or policy relating to Lazonby Conservation area or its Grade II designated heritage assets, the significance or condition of the assets, their setting or future management. For full text see Appendix R 	<p>Were previously consulted and reply received dated 26 January 2016 (see Appendix Li)</p> <p>Comments noted and we acknowledge the importance of the historical aspects in the village, which we believe are reflected in the provisions of the Design Guide.</p> <p>We feel that this is done sufficiently.</p> <p>We believe that these points are all covered in Section 6.2 and the Design Guide.</p>
Environment Agency	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection – see Appendix M No further comment to make – by email 19.07.2017 	
Highways Agency	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No objection as I feel the effects on the Strategic Highway Network would be minimal due to the distance away from the A66 and M6 motorway and therefore would not effect it were this plan to go forward. 	

High Hesket Parish Council	
• No response	
Ainstable Parish Council	
• No response	
Kirkoswald Parish Council	
• No response	
Glassonby Parish Council	
• No response	
Great Salkeld Parish Council	
• No response	
Penrith Town Council	
• No response	
Cumbria County Council	
• No response	
Eden District Council	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5.15 – Isn't the Design Guide intended to influence the design of all new development, not just the housing? • Policy D2 – Does this policy seek to restrict windfall sites from coming forward? • Brownfield or Greenfield? Clarification is required. • Policy D4 – Please note that the policy as currently drafted, could possibly restrict how Bells seek to develop/extend their site in future given its concern with seeking to conserve views out of the Conservation Area. Maybe something to give further thought to? • Policy D5 – New planting has to be agreed by EDC anyway. Implications for the policy if Eden loses an Arboriculturist? • Policy D6 – What is this? • Local Green Spaces are not the same as areas of amenity value and public open space. What is this policy seeking to do? See paras 76-78 of the NPPF. Also the detail of the policy about the PROVISION as well as protection but this is not reflected in the policy title. • What is the development threshold for requiring this? • Policy D7 – See paras 76-78 of the NPPF' • I'm not sure that you mean Local Green Spaces, more public open space?. 	<p>Design Guide to be reworded and 5.1.5 to be reworded to include commercial sites as well as housing.</p> <p>Policy to be reworded so that windfall sites (less than 3 dwellings) are not excluded on either Brownfield or Greenfield sites.</p> <p>We consider that this is adequately covered by EDC Planning Regulations when proposals come forward.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Policy to be rewritten to make sure that this policy says what we intend it to mean. Definitions will be added to the Glossary.</p> <p>Policy to be rewritten to make its meaning clearer and Sports England Planning Policy to be considered in the rewording.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regardless of what the development is, ie. retail, commercial, residential?. • The plan should be clearer about what it means by this. Also, what is the development threshold for requiring this? • Please note that this is contrary to Sports England Planning Policy Statement. Any planning application minded for approval by EDC, which is contrary to Sports England's advice would be called-in for determination by the Secretary of State. • Policy H1 – This sentence is somewhat ambiguous; do you mean 'larger developments on allocated sites and smaller housing schemes (ie. regardless of whether the site is allocated) or 'small and larger developments on allocated sites'? Think about amending the wording as appropriate to provide clarity. • Any housing development or just that on allocated sites? • Policy H2 – Are you aware that this policy re-affirms what EDC already does? • This can also be secured through a planning condition. • Would this need the Parish to become a signatory? • Policy B1 – What about extensions to existing businesses, such as Bells and Princes? • Is this wording necessary? Surely most businesses will provide an element of local employment? It would not be possible to refuse an application if it failed to provide local employment opportunities. • Policy B2 – In what way? By bus, foot, private car? • Would the insertion of these two words here avoid the need for bullet 5? It seems there's an element of duplication between bullets 4 and 5? Does the policy otherwise prevent new buildings for farm diversification and, if so, why? • Policy B3 – Amenity issues? Hours of opening? • Policy I1 – How will applicants know about the capacity of existing infrastructure? Statutory Consultees would comment on this during the determination of a planning application. 	<p>Policy to be reworded to remove 'larger' and 'smaller'.</p> <p>Comment noted and last sentence removed.</p> <p>Policy to be reworded to include 'new and existing business premises'.</p> <p>Point 2 regarding access to be modified; point 4 to be reworded; points 5 and 6 to be removed. Examples to be added to Policy.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Reworded to be more specific and to note that the relevant authorities (utility companies) will have to be consulted.</p> <p>Reworded in accordance with suggestions made.</p>
---	---

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy I2 – None at all? What about extensions to existing buildings where no off-street parking is provided and provision is not possible? • What are these? Please clarify for the avoidance of doubt. • Design within the Parish – This whole section needs to be clearer about what you want from new development. It contains a lot of statements about the form of existing development but does not explicitly state how new development (including extensions to existing development) should be designed – in many cases this is inferred but not clearly stated. • 4.1.1 – Does this contradict the earlier comment about not imposing a ‘strict design criteria’? • 4.9 – Are you saying that new developments should incorporate chimneys? Lead flashing is expensive and, consequently, housing developers may take the view that they are not going to provide chimneys. • 4.11.3 – Even outside of the Conservation Area? Does the comment ‘need to be strongly justified’ go against at 4.1.1 that ‘it is not the intention to impose strict design criteria’? • Other comments cover typos, suggested re-wording and layout. See Appendix S for full text 	<p>To be rewritten in line with suggestions however it is stressed that this is a strongly recommended approach and not a policy.</p>
Langwathby Parish Council	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No comment to make 	
Hesket Park	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response 	
Bells of Lazonby	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response 	
Princes (Eden Valley Mineral) Water Company	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response 	
North Associates	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No response 	
Story Homes	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy D2 – suggest revision of Policy to allow alternative Greenfield development to come forward 	<p>Amendments in light of EDC comments address this point.</p> <p>Amendments to the Design Guide in light of EDC comments deal with this.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy D3 – suggest policy is reworded to allow greater flexibility in terms of deviation from the Design Guide • Policy D5 – suggest Policy is reworded to allow for the replacement of trees & hedgerows where their retention is not possible or where this would result in a better overall planting scheme. See Appendix W for full text 	<p>This Policy is designed to protect the limited number of trees and hedgerows left in the parish.</p>
<p>Lazonby Estates</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to public footpaths on Lazonby Fell. See Appendix V1, V2, V3, V4, V5, V6, V7 for full text 	<p>Advice to be sought from Cumbria County Council Rights of Way officer. There is within the Parish a strong demand that these paths should be accessible, but advice will be sought on the current status of the legality of re-establishing deleted footpaths through the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Brackenburgh Estates</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to public footpaths on Lazonby Fell. See Appendix T1, T2, T3 for full text 	<p>Advice to be sought from Cumbria County Council Rights of Way officer. There is within the Parish a strong demand that these paths should be accessible, but advice will be sought on the current status of the legality of re-establishing deleted footpaths through the Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
<p>Garden of Eden Fishing</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objection to public footpath alongside River Eden on Lazonby Estates. See Appendix U for full text 	<p>Comments noted and advice to be sought from Cumbria County Council Rights of Way officer.</p>

11 APPENDICES

- Appendix A – Press Release
- Appendix B – Questionnaire
- Appendix C – Questionnaire Spread Sheet and PowerPoint
- Appendix D – Summary of Draft Plan Leaflet
- Appendix E – Photographs taken at Public Drop-In Event
- Appendix F – Summary Response Sheet Proforma
- Appendix G – Time Line of Meetings
- Appendix H – Summary Leaflet
- Appendix I – Request for Screening Opinion
- Appendix J – Executive Summary
- Appendix K – Public Consultation Meeting Advertisement
- Appendix L 1 – Response from Historic England – January 2016
- Appendix L2 – Response from Historic England – April 2017
- Appendix M – Habitats Regulation Assessment Screening Report
- Appendix N – Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Report
- Appendix O – Letter giving notice of pre-submission Public Consultation
- Appendix P – Newspaper Advertisement
- Appendix Q – Media Release
- Appendix R – Response from Historic England – July 2017
- Appendix S1 – Plan Response from EDC – August 2017
- Appendix S2 – Design Guide Response from EDC – August 2017
- Appendix T1 - Letter from James Turner, Brackenburgh Estates
- Appendix T2 – Response on behalf of Brackenburgh Estates
- Appendix T3 – Letter from Cragnook Quarry, Brackenburgh Estate
- Appendix U – Letter from Garden of Eden Fishing
- Appendix V1 - Letter from Dunnewoods
- Appendix V2 – Letter on behalf of Lazonby Estate Settlement 2000
- Appendix V3 – Letter from Russell Bowman Tenant Farmer Lazonby Estates
- Appendix V4 – Letter from Annabelle Stapleton, Lazonby Estates
- Appendix V5 – Letter from Serena Williams-Ellis, Lazonby Estates
- Appendix V6 – Letter from John Atkinson
- Appendix V7 – Letter from Andrew Dyer
- Appendix W – Comments from Story Homes